



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/055,594	01/22/2002	Roland E. Williams	P-2180	6960

24214 7590 04/17/2006

JAMES D IVEY
3025 TOTTERDELL STREET
OAKLAND, CA 94611-1742

EXAMINER

VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/055,594

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS, ROLAND E.

Examiner

Huyen X. Vo

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection in view of by Ito (US 6243675) and Bellegarda et al. (US 6208971) necessitated by claim amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ito (US Patent No. 6243675).

4. Regarding claim 1, Ito discloses a language module which is attachable to an appliance, which is configured to communicate directly with the appliance when so attached without the use of a network which extends outside the appliance (*dictionary 30 is the language module or memory attachable to the appliance (navigation system 1) in figure 1*), and which is configured to perform language-specific tasks at the request of the appliance by: receiving an instruction for language-specific processing from the

appliance (*language is identified by the appliance and appropriate dictionary is selected*); and sending resulting data of the language-specific processing to the appliance (*selected dictionary is used to recognize input speech and result of the recognition is sent back to the appliance, referring to figures 1-2 and 5*).

5. Regarding claim 2, Ito further discloses the language module of claim 1 wherein the language module is configured to perform language-specific tasks according to a subject language at the requests of the appliance by also: receiving data representing a character in the subject language (*figures 4-5*); and sending data specifying a graphical representation of the character to the appliance (*inherently in the system of Ito because Japanese, English and German use different character fonts*).

6. Regarding claim 3, Ito further discloses the language module of claim 1 wherein the language module is configured to perform language-specific tasks according to a subject language at the request of the appliance by also: receiving data representing a user input gesture (*user selects language, col. 5, lines 13-23*); and sending data representing one or more language units of the subject language in accordance with the user input gesture (*select dictionary, col. 5, lines 13-67 or figure 5*).

7. Regarding claims 4-6, Ito further discloses the language module of claim 3 wherein the language units are characters (*dictionary 30 in figure 2*), wherein the

language units are words (*dictionary 30 in figure 2*), wherein the language units are phrases (*dictionary 30 in figure 2*).

8. Regarding claim 7, Ito further discloses the language module of claim 3 wherein sending comprises: selecting the one or more language units according to one or more preceding language units, which were previously specified by the user (*figure2, system identify the language intended by the user and select that language*).

9. Regarding claim 10, Ito further discloses the language module of claim 3 wherein the language module is configured to perform language-specific tasks according to the subject language at the request of the appliance by also: sending data representing one or more language unit components which are of the subject language and which correspond to the user input gesture (*figure 2, system identifies the language of the user's input and select appropriate dictionary*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2626

11. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito (US 6243675) in view of Bellegarda et al. (US 6208971).

12. Regarding claims 8-9, Ito fails to specifically disclose the language module of claim 7 wherein selecting comprises: determining word-continuation and name-continuation relationships between the preceding language units and the one or more language units. However, Bellegarda et al. teach determining word-continuation and name-continuation relationships between the preceding language units and the one or more language units (*col. 3, lines 1-11, further details referring to col. 4, line 39 to col. 5, line 67, current word depends on previous words*).

Since Ito and Bellegarda et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Ito by incorporating the teaching of Bellegarda et al. in order to speech command recognition accuracy.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Janqua et al. (US 4615257), Majaniemi (US 6393403), Bangalore et al. (US 6868383), Howard et al. (US 6513006), Brash (US 5960384), and Fogarty (US 6311180) are considered pertinent to the claimed invention.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HXV

4/5/2006



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER